

GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
ETHAN D. DETTMER, SBN 196046  
edettmer@gibsondunn.com  
ABIGAIL A. BARRERA, SBN 301746  
abarrera@gibsondunn.com  
ASHLEY J. HODGE, SBN 287653  
ahodge@gibsondunn.com  
ANTHONY D. BEDEL, SBN 324065  
tbedel@gibsondunn.com  
555 Mission Street, Suite 3000  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: 415.393.8200  
Facsimile: 415.393.8306

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
ALEXANDER H. SOUTHWELL (*pro hac vice*)  
asouthwell@gibsondunn.com  
200 Park Avenue, 48th Floor  
New York, NY 10166  
Telephone: 212.351.4000  
Facsimile: 212.351.4035

Attorneys for Defendant PLAID INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

JAMES COTTLE, et al.,

Plaintiff,

v.

PLAID INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 4:20-cv-03056-DMR

**DEFENDANT PLAID INC.'S RESPONSE IN  
SUPPORT OF CURTIS PLAINTIFFS'  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO  
CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD  
BE RELATED**

Hon. Donna M. Ryu

Action Filed: May 4, 2020

Trial Date: None Set

1 On July 8, 2020, Plaintiffs Rachel Curtis, Alexa Grossman, Mallory Grossman, Steven  
2 Hannigan, Alexis Mullen, Jordan Sacks, and Nicholas Yeomelakis (the “Curtis Plaintiffs”) filed an  
3 Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should be Related, arguing that the above-  
4 captioned case is related to *Curtis v. Plaid Inc.*, No. 4:20-cv-04344-DMR (N.D. Cal.). See Dkt. No.  
5 42.

6 Plaid Inc. supports the Curtis Plaintiffs’ Administrative Motion because both actions “concern  
7 substantially the same [alleged] parties, property, transaction or event.” Civ. L.R. 3-12(a)(1), (2).  
8 The actions involve the same defendant, Plaid Inc., and the same plaintiffs since the putative  
9 nationwide class is identical. Moreover, the two actions involve similar legal theories, and the *Curtis*  
10 action includes a subset of the causes of action alleged in *Cottle*. Further, both complaints allege  
11 similar facts relating to Plaid’s supposed violations of federal privacy laws.

12 Thus, given the similarity of the alleged parties, underlying factual allegations, and legal  
13 theories, relating these two actions will promote efficiency and prevent inconsistent results. Indeed,  
14 relation would mitigate the “unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense” that Plaid Inc.  
15 would be required to expend in the event it had to litigate these matters separately. Civ. L.R. 3-  
16 12(a)(2).

17  
18 Dated: July 8, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

19 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

20  
21 By: /s/ Ethan Dettmer

22 Ethan D. Dettmer (SBN 196046)  
23 555 Mission Street, Suite 3000  
24 San Francisco, CA 94105-0921  
Telephone: 415.393.8200  
Fax: 415.393.8306

25  
26 *Attorneys for Defendant Plaid Inc.*  
27  
28